	Case 4:15-cv-00156-RCC-LAB Docume	ent 10 Filed 05/04/15 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	Amy Ann Thomas,) No. CV 15-156-TUC-RCC (LAB)
10	Plaintiff,) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
11	vs.)
12	Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner) of Social Security,	
13	Defendant.))
14		ý
15	Pending before the court is the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis	
16	filed on April 15, 2015. (Doc. 2)	
17	The plaintiff, Amy Ann Thomas, filed this action for review of the final decision of	
18	the Commissioner for Social Security pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). (Doc. 1) She argues	
19	the Commissioner's finding that she is not disabled is not supported by substantial evidence.	
20	Id.	
21	Pursuant to the Rules of Practice of this court, this matter was referred to Magistrate	
22	Judge Bowman for report and recommendation. LRCiv 72.2(a).	
23		
24	<u>Discussion</u>	
25	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), this court may permit an action to go forward	
26	without prepayment of fees and costs if the plaintiff submits an affidavit attesting that she	
27	is unable to pay such costs.	
28		

In this case, Thomas filed an affidavit in which she reports that her spouse has an 1 2 income of \$5,000 per month or \$60,000 per year. (Doc. 2, p. 2) She estimates her home has 3 a value of \$125,000 and her two motor vehicles have a combined value of \$33,000. (Doc. 2, p. 4) Her spouse has a personal savings account with a value of \$1,500. (Doc. 2, p. 3) 4 5 She and her spouse have two dependents. *Id*. 6 Thomas further estimates the family's monthly living expenses at \$6,489.50 or 7 approximately \$1,500 in excess of her spouse's income. (Doc. 2, p. 6) Nevertheless, on this 8 record, the court cannot conclude that Thomas is indigent and unable to pay the court's filing 9 fee of \$400.00. See, e.g., Sears, Roebuck and Co. v. Charles W. Sears Real Estate, Inc., 865 F.2d 22, 23 (2nd Cir. 1988) (Defendant with "net income at approximately \$20,000" was not 10 11 indigent and "not entitled to proceed in forma pauperis."); Brewster v. North Am. Van Lines, *Inc.*; 461 F.2d 649, 651 (7th Cir. 1972) (Plaintiff with salary of approximately \$16,500 per 12 13 year could not proceed in forma pauperis.). Accordingly, 14 RECOMMENDATION 15 16 17 18 pauperis filed on April 15, 2015. (Doc. 2) 19

The Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court, after its independent review of the record, enter an order DENYING the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636 (b), any party may serve and file written objections within 14 days of being served with a copy of this report and recommendation. If objections are not timely filed, they may be deemed waived. The Local Rules permit a response to an objection. They do not permit a reply to a response.

DATED this 1st day of May, 2015.

Leolie a. Bo

United States Magistrate Judge

28

27

20

21

22

23

24

25

26